

## Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/604,059

Applicant(s)

PEREZ ET AL.

Examiner

Nghia M. Doan

Art Unit

2825

### All Participants:

(1) Nghia M. Doan.

(2) Kotulak Richard (Reg. No. 27,712).

Status of Application: Allowance

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 16 October 2007

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

### Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☒ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

### Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

*Claim 1*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Ker et al. (cited in the final office action)*

### Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

### Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: According to the Appeal Brief Filed on 07/25/2007, The applicant's argument is persuasive by incorporating the application specification into the claim language. Hence, Examiner suggests Applicant to clarify the claim language upon the argument in the Appeal Brief that distincts over Ker et al. which is recited in the final office action mailed on 03/21/2007.